



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/705,784	11/11/2003	Stephen F. Ridley	HMD-1	HMD-1 5220	
22827	7590 04/24/2006	EXAMINER			
DORITY & MANNING, P.A. POST OFFICE BOX 1449			JAWORSKI, FRANCIS J		
GREENVILLE, SC 29602-1449			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3768		

DATE MAILED: 04/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/705,784	RIDLEY ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Jaworski Francis J.	3737			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period versiling to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONED	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2006 . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1.3-8.10-13.28.30-31.33.42-50.52-54 and 56 - 70 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1.3-8.10-13.28.30-31.33.42-50.52-54 and 56-70 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the orection to the orect	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is objected.	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies 	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage			
Attachmont/s)					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dai 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/705,784 Page 2

Art Unit: 3737

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 28 and 42, 56 – 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kopp et al (US4108165) which teaches a medical biopsy probe device and method of using same where the device includes a transducer assembly including a transducer housing which includes a base and defines a probe guide opening, and having a sterilizable seal 22, 24, 26 as aforementioned and also a sterile insert tubing sleeve within bore 14 (see col. 3 lines 15 – 22) which constitute together non-pliable first and second portions removably attachable which serve as a removably cooperable sterile barrier or seal and serve to provide a probe guide for unimpeded passage of the probe, and a radial clamp mechanism 30, 32 part of which is integral to the sterile barrier or seal and which is adapted to secure 24 such as shown in Fig. 4b so that theprobe is secured within the probe guide at a vertical angle position.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 3737

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-4, 30-31, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kopp et al as argued above, and further in view of Dardel (US5341810) since the latter teaches that a sterile seal may include pliant thermoplastic sterile sleeve 16 where the embodiment includes a cylindrical transducer such as in Kopp et al and is adapted to extend the probe in the direction of the transmitted beam, and further teaches that the sterile containment may include separable portions.

Claims 3 - 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kopp et al. as applied to claims above, and further in view of Jingu (US4491137) since the latter teaches that where a sterile probe guide adaptor oriented perpendicular to the base of a probe device is used as in Kopp et al., a pliant thermoplastic sleeve 10 may be used to seal an ensonating linear ultrasound transducer from the patient.

Claims 7 and 10, are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kopp et al as applied to claims above, and further in view of Kelly, jr et al (US6475152) since the latter teaches that a sterile clamp may be used to secure the biopsy device to the ultrasound imaging array and further that when the combination of a sterile guide 32 and sterilizable seal 100 are used the linear array transducer itself may be arcuate in profile in order to conform to the body surface as shown in Fig. 4 therein.

Art Unit: 3737

Claims 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kopp et al in view of Kelly Jr. et al as applied to claims above, and further in view of Lin (US6261234) which teaches that in Fig. 3B when an arcuate transducer is used in this type of device the instrument path defined by the biopsy probe channel opening is perpendicular to the tangent point of the arcuate profile base and parallel to the imaging plane while outside the area of the transducer(s) in order to engage tissue at the contact coupling point of the ultrasound ensonation which tracks the instrument.

Claims 12 – 13, 43-50, 52-54, 59 - 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kopp et al in view of Kelly, Jr et al as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Vilkomerson et al (US4249539) which teaches that the location and motion of the probe tip may be tracked in realtime soas to create a virtual display on a monitor by including a receive transducer within the instrument itself hence the technique is applicable across sterile barriers as in the former. Kelly Jr. et al otherwise teaches that the instrument probe path may be parallel to the plane of the sonogram. Vilkomerson et al otherwise notes that venous catheterization is an applicable use for this type of device, see col. 1 lines 31-37.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kopp et al in view of Dardell as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Carroll et al (US5119818) which teaches that a sterile seal 200 of fig. 3 might include a base portion as well as a sleeve since this protects both the sterile needle as well as the tissue contact point from the unsterilized ultrasound instrument.

Application/Control Number: 10/705,784 Page 5

Art Unit: 3737

Response to Arguments

Claims as amended yet are readable on the cooperable and sterilizable components of Kopp et al which serve to create a multi-component sterile seal for the ultrasound transducer assembly as well as serve to clampthe member(s) to the assembly and maintain the biopsy or other probe member in an angular confinement

This action is NOT made final however the case should be prepared for final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jaworski Francis J. at telephone number 571-272-4738

FJJ:fjj

09202005

Francis J. Jaworski Primary Examiner